

## Remote Operations Center Committee Meeting 5/12/05

Attendees:

FNAL: Elvin Harms, Erik Gottschalk, Shuichi Kunori, Suzanne Panacek, Kaori

Maeshima

CERN: Patricia McBride, Mike Lamont

OTHER LOCATIONS: David Rice, Jean Slaughter

### Committee Organization – Erik Gottschalk

1) We have five new members in the advisory committee, since our last meeting on May 4, 2005 (see slides linked from the our web page)

2) Mailing lists have been established ([REMOP@fnal.gov](mailto:REMOP@fnal.gov) for the core committee, and [REMOP\\_ADVISORY@fnal.gov](mailto:REMOP_ADVISORY@fnal.gov) for the advisory committee). The mailing lists are “open”, so anybody can send e-mail to the lists. The mail messages sent to these lists are archived.

3) A document database is being used to gather reference material for the committee. One can get to the document database by following the link from our web page (<http://home.fnal.gov/~eeg/remop.html>). Send e-mail to [erik@fnal.gov](mailto:erik@fnal.gov) if you would like to access password-protected documents. A **feature** of the document database is that it can be configured to send e-mail notifications when new documents are added to the database. If anybody is interested in setting up this feature, please contact Erik.

4) Advisory Committee review meetings: we are considering two reviews to ask members of the advisory committee to provide feedback on requirements.

Elvin: suggests two mid-term Advisory Committee reviews

- mid June
- a week before the end of July (just before our first deadline)

5) We are using a new feature for video conferencing provided by ESnet. Our video meetings can be accessed via streaming video from a web page. This makes it possible to record meetings so that they can be archived in the document database for committee members who missed the “live” meeting.

Jean – the recorded meeting video will be useful for her, since she anticipates moving around quite a bit.

Kaori – it is still useful to have people present for discussion purpose. People viewing a taped meeting should be able to give feedback.

Erik – feedback sent to the committee can be added to the document database along with the meeting minutes and the video recording of the meeting

6) Kaori and Shuichi recommend that Dragoslav Lazic (CMS HCAL Group) should be considered for the Advisory Committee.

### CERN report – Mike Lamont

Brief history – a remote operations prototype was initially proposed by DESY about 4 years ago. At the time it was strongly discouraged by the Director General at the time (L. Maiani). Following a GAN workshop, remote operation was brought up again 2 years ago to a lukewarm response inside the (Accelerator & Beams) AB department. Steve Myers, the head of AB, is still not sold on idea, but is prepared to discuss the issue.

Organization: AB is responsible for controls, operations, power converters, RF beam instrumentation etc. Installation and hardware commissioning are the responsibility of the Technical Support (TS) department. Roberto Saban, who leads the hardware commissioning, has reservations regarding unrestricted remote access to data coming from the commissioning.

Hermann Schmickler will take over the Controls Group at the end 2005. He is supportive and would like to see some activity (N.B. Hermann has agreed to be a member of the Advisory Committee on 5/13/05)

Message: there is patchy enthusiasm. We should try to convince Steve Myers about the usefulness of remote operations for CERN. There are clear resource and manpower issues to be addressed with regard to hardware commissioning. Putting effort into something that has no clear benefit for CERN will be perceived negatively.

Selling points:

- avoid draining resources, results must add value to CERN
- support of instrumentation, equipment developed at FNAL and elsewhere
- LARP work – support for LHC commissioning.

Elvin:

- Is there any other remote access that we can dovetail with?

Mike:

- Central Control room – brand new, operation of all CERN's accelerator.
- There should be video conferencing facilities there
- New infrastructure, large screens, machine status etc., good opportunity to integrate remote transfer.

Jean:

- Will there be a remote control for CMS in building 40?

Mike;

- we have no communication with them at this time
- Experiments and machine signals, however, will be distributed, you could subscribe to these signals remotely as well

## **Stakeholders – Suzanne Panacek**

Why do we want to identify stakeholders for a Remote Operations Center?

- 1) This helps to identify the people who have an interest in a Remote Operations Center.
- 2) We should talk to stakeholders to discuss scenarios and gather requirements.
- 3) If we don't do this, we may miss important requirements.
- 4) It is easier to identify and resolve conflicts before we begin designing a Remote Operations Center.

- 5) Explicitly identifying stakeholders now could help trigger informal conversations about remote operations with stakeholders we rarely talk to (for example, someone from the DOE).

There was discussion regarding the proposed list of stakeholders, and this list needs to be refined. This is an iterative process, and we will discuss an updated list at our next meeting.

### **Subgroups and Scenarios – Erik Gottschalk**

Divide into two subgroups: Accelerator and Detector.

Assignment – each group should write 3 scenarios for next week.

Kaori – About the example scenario ... when 200k pixels are dead it will be noticed earlier rather than by track-efficiency monitoring

Erik – this might require constant monitoring of pixels occupancy plots

Shuichi – Remote Operations Center could provide access to considerable information for this type of problem.

Kaori – Systematic monitoring to find intermittent problem is more efficient.

Next meeting: May 19, 2005